



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

granate trees, several of which hung about the fountain with seats in their shade, and, for the rest, there seemed to be mostly roses and oleanders, with other shrubs of the kind that made the greatest show of blossom and cost the least for tendance."

It was in this garden that Don Ippolito told his love. We are aware that to consider Providence and New York not worthy to be mentioned in the same breath with it is a strictly conservative view of the case, and the author of "Their Wedding Journey" and "A Chance Acquaintance" has already proved himself, where American local color is concerned, a thoroughgoing radical. We may ground our objection to the dubious element, in this instance, on saying that the story is Don Ippolito's, and that in virtue of that fact it should not have floated beyond the horizon of the lagoons. It is the poor priest's property, as it were; we grudge even the reversion of it to Mr. Ferris. We confess even to a regret at seeing it survive Don Ippolito at all, and should have advocated a trustful surrender of Florida Vervain's subsequent fortunes to the imagination of the reader. But we have no desire to expatiate restrictively on a work in which, at the worst, the imagination finds such abundant pasture. "A Foregone Conclusion" will take its place as a singularly perfect production. That the author was an artist his other books had proved, but his art ripens and sweetens in the sun of success. His manner has now refined itself till it gives one a sense of pure *quality* which it really taxes the ingenuity to express. There is not a word in the present volume as to which he has not known consummately well what he was about; there is an exquisite intellectual comfort in feeling one's self in such hands. Mr. Howells has ranked himself with the few writers on whom one counts with luxurious certainty, and this little masterpiece confirms our security.

10. — *Some Leading Principles of Political Economy newly expounded.*

By J. E. CAIRNES, M. A., Emeritus Professor of Political Economy in University College, London. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1874. 8vo. pp. 421.

SINCE the death of Mr. Mill, Professor Cairnes is probably the most authoritative living writer on political economy in our language. This, we hasten to add, is said without disparagement to the claims which may be put forward in behalf of our own countryman, Mr. Carey, who is regarded by a considerable body of readers as the prophet of an altogether new dispensation from that of the English

school. But Mr. Carey's claims, as the founder of an enduring system, are yet to be made good, and it may be doubted whether, with his infelicities of method and style, his exposition of his own doctrine can ever become an authority. Professor Cairnes, however, has every qualification necessary for a leading writer, if we except the physical strength requisite for great literary activity. His power of analysis is remarkable, his judgment is even, and his use of language is forcible without apparent effort. He is a scholar without being a *doctrinaire*, while his knowledge of practical affairs is extensive and his observation of them constant and keen. Moreover, his application of economical principles in solving great social or financial problems affords some of the most remarkable instances of conclusive explanation of the past and successful prediction of the future to be found in the literature of the science.

In his present publication, which had been awaited with great eagerness, Professor Cairnes has undertaken "to recast some considerable portion of political economy." In pursuance of this design he reviews and discusses the received theories of value, of supply and demand, of natural or, as he prefers to call it, normal value, of cost of production, and of market value; he investigates at length the problem of wages, including the vexed question of the wages-fund, and the theory and possibilities of trades-unionism; and finally presents a masterly discussion of the doctrine of international trade. Passing by questions of nomenclature, such as must always present themselves in a science which unfortunately has to draw its terminology from the shifting language of common discourse, the great value of Professor Cairnes's work will be found, we believe, in his investigation of the effects produced by the regular failure of competition in certain cases where its action is generally assumed to be complete. The precise nature of the service thus done by him can be understood best if we compare his position with that of Mr. Mill; and we are the more interested in making the comparison, because the question is one which involves in no slight degree the claim of political economy to the rank of a science undergoing a regular and systematic development. In his previously published essay on "M. Comte and Political Economy," Professor Cairnes accepted continuity of development as one of the tests of a science as distinguished from mere metaphysical discussion; and, entering upon a review of economical speculation in four leading departments, from Adam Smith down, he said:—

"I venture to assert that a more remarkable example of continuity of doctrine, of development of seminal ideas, of original *aperçus* extended, corrected,

occasionally recast, of new discoveries supplementing, sometimes modifying the old,—in short, of all the indications of progressive science,—will not easily be found even in the history of physical speculation.” — *Essays in Political Economy*, p. 287.

Does his own work, then, make a break in the essential continuity of doctrine which has been observed thus far, or is it only a new stage in the steady growth of a great and firmly rooted body of principles? In view of the test just referred to, the question is one of some moment.

We take first, then, Professor Cairnes's statement of the correction to be made in the common theories as to competition for labor. The general doctrine is, that the natural or average, or, as he prefers to call it, the normal value of commodities depends upon their costs of production. This principle is an inevitable consequent of the proposition that the competition of laborers tends to produce equivalent (not equal) wages in all employments,—allowance being made for the difficulty, agreeableness, or regularity of the occupation, and the like, as in the familiar statement of Adam Smith; and that the competition of capital for the most remunerative employments tends to produce equivalent rates of profit in all. It is usually assumed that competition is universally effective for these purposes; that, for example, the competition of labor, with which we are now more particularly concerned, is effective over the whole field of employment,—distributing to each class of labor its due and proportionate reward, and causing all commodities, so far as this element of their cost goes, to exchange for each other in proportion to their respective costs of production. In the common form of the statement, that “the cost of production is the *necessary* price or value of all things produced by labor and capital,” it is implied that the competition of laborers in any one country is universal and effective; and most political economists, when dealing with the general theories of wages and of value, reason upon the statement as if this were the case.

Professor Cairnes, however, points to the undeniable fact, that the competition of laborers is not general, as has been assumed, but is limited and effective only within its limits:—

“What we find in effect,” he says, “is, not a whole population competing indiscriminately for all occupations, but a series of industrial layers, superposed on one another, within each of which the various candidates for employment possess a real and effective power of selection, while those occupying the several strata are, for all purposes of effective competition, practically isolated from each other. . . . No doubt the various ranks and classes fade into each other by imperceptible gradations, and individuals from all classes

are constantly passing up or dropping down; but while this is so, it is nevertheless true that the average workman, from whatever rank he be taken, finds his power of competition limited for practical purposes to a certain range of occupations, so that, however high the rates of remuneration in those which lie beyond may rise, he is excluded from sharing them. We are thus compelled to recognize the existence of non-competing industrial groups as a feature of our social economy." (p. 66.)

This failure of competition is a fact which can be verified by observation at any moment. If, however, we trace the consequences of this failure, it is readily seen that some important changes must be made in our statement of the law of natural or normal value. The ratio in which commodities produced by laborers of the same group, or of competing groups, will exchange, will depend on their cost of production, because of the competition; but the ratio of exchange of commodities produced by laborers of non-competing groups must plainly depend upon something else. What, then, will govern it? It will at once occur to the student of political economy, that while the problem thus offered exposes a serious deficiency in the usual statement of the law of value, it also presents a strong analogy with the case of international trade, where, by reason of the comparative immobility of labor and capital, and the consequent failure of a complete competition between the labor and capital of different countries, the ratio in which commodities are exchanged by trading countries is held not to depend on their respective costs of production. As may be anticipated, then, Professor Cairnes finds his solution for the new problem in the same influence which, as Mill has shown, settles the conditions of international trade; that is, in the action of reciprocal demand and supply upon all those exchanges which take place outside of the limits of effective competition, and hence beyond the control of cost of production as the governing principle. To quote his own language:—

"As in international trade an increased demand for the products of other countries will, other things being equal, affect international values—or, let us say, affect the relative prices of the products of different countries—unfavorably for the country whose demand is increased; and as, again, the converse of this condition, an increased demand by other countries for the products of a given country, will operate in the contrary direction; so it will be in the exchanges which take place between non-competing domestic groups. Whatever increases the demand of a given group for the products of outside, that is to say non-competing, industries, or (what comes to the same thing) whatever increases the supply of its products available for the purchase of the products of such industries, will, other things being the same, depress the prices of its products in relation to the prices of the products of the industries

against which they are exchanged, and *vice versa*; while whatever increases the demand of the outside industries for the products of a given group will have the contrary effect, and will raise the level of its prices in relation to those of the non-competing groups with which it trades, and *vice versa*." (p. 90.)

Stated in its simplest form, — and the principle is essentially simple, although its applications are infinitely complex, — exchange values between non-competing groups are determined by reciprocal demand and supply. The consequences flowing from this qualification of the general law of value are serious. Plainly there may be whole classes of the laboring population whose labor uniformly finds a reward below that which a general competition would secure, and whole classes of commodities whose value in exchange for others is uniformly below that which their cost of production would require; while other classes in both kinds may be as much above the level which general competition would establish. In any application of political economy to social problems, permanent inequalities of this sort are manifestly too important to be safely left out of sight.

If now we turn to Mr. Mill's chapter on wages, we shall find what our present author would call the seminal idea of this important re-statement of the law of value, in a recognition of the failure of competition between different classes of laborers: —

"So complete, indeed, has hitherto been the separation, so strongly marked the line of demarcation, between the different grades of laborers, as to be almost equivalent to an hereditary distinction of caste. . . . Consequently the wages of each class have hitherto been regulated by the increase of its own population rather than of the general population of the country. . . . The changes, however, now so rapidly taking place in usages and ideas are undermining all these distinctions; the habits or disabilities which chained people to their hereditary condition are fast wearing away, and every class is exposed to increased and increasing competition from at least the class immediately below it." — MILL'S *Principles of Political Economy*, Book II. ch. xiv. § 2.

In the chapter on the "Ultimate Analysis of Cost of Production," it is shown that this failure of general competition affects value: —

"When the wages of an employment permanently exceed the average rate, the value of the thing produced will, in the same degree, exceed the standard determined by the mere quantity of labor. Things, for example, which are made by skilled labor, exchange for the produce of a much greater quantity of unskilled labor; for no reason but because the labor is more highly paid. If, through the extension of education, the laborers competent to skilled employments were so increased in number as to diminish the difference between their wages and those of common labor, all things produced

by labor of the superior kind would fall in value, compared with things produced by common labor, and these might be said therefore to rise in value. We have before remarked that the difficulty of passing from one class of employments to a class greatly superior, has hitherto caused the wages of all those classes of laborers who are separated from one another by any very marked barrier, to depend more than might be supposed upon the increase of the population of each class, considered separately; and that the inequalities in the remuneration of labor are much greater than could exist if the competition of the laboring people generally could be brought practically to bear on each particular employment. It follows from this, that wages in different employments do not rise or fall simultaneously, but are, for short and sometimes even for long periods, nearly independent of one another. All such disparities evidently alter the *relative* cost of production of different commodities, and will therefore be completely represented in their natural or average value." — *Ibid.*, Book III. ch. iv. § 3.

And in one instance at least, where the failure of competition is complete, in the case of slave-grown produce, he expressly recognizes the effect upon value : —

"In this case, as in all cases of permanent inequality between the wages of different employments, prices and values receive the impress of the inequality. Slave-grown will exchange for non-slave-grown commodities in a less ratio than that of the quantity of labor required for their production; the value of the former will be less, of the latter greater, than if slavery did not exist." — *Ibid.*, Book III. ch. vi. § 3.

How it happened that Mr. Mill, with his intense interest in all that concerns the lower laboring classes, did not follow out the train of ideas upon which he had thus struck, especially as his own brilliant development of Ricardo's theory of international trade pointed by close analogy to the solution of the questions raised, it is not important for our present purpose to inquire. But that the essential doctrine, developed by Cairnes, was thrown out by Mill, — and that not in any accidental way, but as the announcement of a limitation of the general law which was distinctly recognized and often present to his mind, — there can be no doubt. As little doubt can there be that the development of this principle with its important consequences is an instance of real growth and not of revolution, involving no breach of continuity, but following the lines indicated by previous investigation. In this capital instance, then, to which a large part of his discussions are related, Professor Cairnes is in direct filiation with the earlier masters of the science.

Turning now to the other agent of production and capital, it is generally assumed that between different countries capital moves with more or less reluctance, and that, competition failing to that

extent, international values depend upon reciprocal demand and supply; but that between different places in the same country capital moves freely, insuring a complete competition for equivalent rates of profit, and that therefore, so far as this element is concerned, values in the home exchanges depend upon cost of production. But the line thus drawn between the domestic trade and the international is an arbitrary one, not justified by facts. Even if capital never moves from country to country without resistance, it often moves with reluctance from one part to another of the same country; and where this is the case, and to that extent, competition fails, and values even in domestic exchanges cease to depend upon cost of production, and are governed by reciprocal demand and supply. Not that the familiar law of value is shown to be incorrect, but, *cessante ratione, cessat ipsa lex*. The reason for the law, which is effective competition, instead of failing at the political frontier, fails even within that boundary in important cases, with respect to capital as well as to labor, and thus the case of exchanges between different districts of the same country, as between the North and the South or the East and the West in the United States, is assimilated to that of international trade and falls under the same law. This imperfection of the line usually drawn between international trade and domestic — an imperfection not so far below the surface as to be likely always to have escaped the attention of persons interested in economical speculation — was seen and pointed out by Mr. Mill: —

“The values of commodities produced at the same place,” he says, “or in places sufficiently adjacent for capital to move freely between them, — let us say, for simplicity, commodities produced in the same country, — depend (temporary fluctuations apart) upon their cost of production. But the value of a commodity brought from a distant place, especially from a foreign country, does not depend on its cost of production in the place from whence it comes,” but “on the cost of production of the thing which is exported to pay for it.” — *Ibid.*, Book III. ch. xviii. § 1.

Here again Mr. Mill omitted to follow out the train of thought on which he had struck, and perhaps the omission was natural for an English writer, considering the compactness and commercial unity of England. Professor Cairnes, however, has not stopped short of a full examination of the conditions under which a domestic trade may be governed by the same law as a foreign trade. The theory laid down by Ricardo and elaborated by Mill for cases where the competition of capital fails, he adopts as one which “sounds the depths of the problem,” but he develops and follows it out in cases where they did not undertake to discuss its application. The general doctrine of value

thus acquires such completeness and consistency with facts as it has never before had, and this not by any uprooting of what had already been accomplished, but by a genuine process of growth and in a strict continuity of scientific development.

But it is now time that we should notice the meaning which Professor Cairnes attaches to the term "cost of production." "The universal elements of cost of production," says Mr. Mill, "are the wages of the labor and the profits of the capital," and this sharply cut definition is the one generally followed. Although it may be objected that this definition is made from the capitalist's point of view, it answers most purposes well enough until we come to the theory of foreign trade and of international values, and even then we doubt if any confusion is often felt until the original supposition of a trade by barter is exchanged for one in which money and price are conditions. So long as the trade is one of barter it is clear that it can go on between countries or districts differently favored by nature; that its possibility will depend simply on each country being able to produce some commodity with more advantage than it can others, although perhaps with greater expenditure of labor than would be necessary in the very country to which the commodity is exported, and that thus the ratio of exchange between the countries will depend, not on the absolute cost of production of the things exchanged, but on the comparative intensity of the reciprocal demands. It is also clear that to substitute a commerce carried on as usual in place of the supposed barter, does not change any of the essential conditions of the case. And yet, when money and price are introduced into the hypothesis, it is certain that price not only measures the comparative costs of production in each country by itself, but also determines the possibility of importing with profit, and so does introduce the absolute cost of producing the commodities in the countries respectively as a condition of the trade. The reluctance with which capital and labor change their place to compete for the most profitable employment frees the terms of international exchange from dependence on the absolute cost of production; the use of money appears to make them thus dependent. How is the contradiction to be reconciled?

Professor Cairnes points out that the difficulty, as is so often the case in any moral science, springs from the ambiguous use of a term which seemed to have been defined with complete precision. The reward for production, he says, is not its "cost," except in a limited sense and from one point of view. What production really "costs" is labor, abstinence, and risk, as a reward for which wages and profits

are paid. Cost of production, in the only sense in which it has any economical importance, is less in a fertile region than in a sterile one, because nature yields a more abundant return for a given amount of labor and of saving. The cost is in fact the sacrifice — not of the capitalist alone, but of the laborer also — which is requisite for attaining the desired end. Cost of production taken in this sense will determine the value at which commodities will exchange under the influence of free competition, as may easily be seen by applying the usual reasoning to the conduct of men, each anxious to secure his material well-being with the least possible sacrifice and free to choose among employments for his labor or capital. And it is cost of production in this sense which fails to regulate the value of commodities in exchange, in international trade, or wherever competition is ineffective, and that too whether the exchange is conducted by barter or by the use of money.

We can scarcely hope that we have been followed in this exposition by any except the few who have given serious attention to what Mr. Mill calls “the most complicated questions which political economy affords.” But we trust it is clear that in this case Professor Cairnes has undertaken to revise the accepted nomenclature of the science in a particular of some importance. In this revision, however, he does not depart so widely from the line of authority as may at first be supposed. To say nothing of Adam Smith’s famous apothegm, “labor was the first price, — the original purchase-money that was paid for all things,” it is certain, we think, that Ricardo, in his chapter on value, has in mind the same conception of cost which is now more formally enunciated by Professor Cairnes ; while in his chapter on foreign trade Ricardo expressly takes the number of days’ labor as his test of cost, whether comparative or absolute, nor does he lose sight of this test when he comes to consider the distribution of money between the countries trading. And it is remarkable that Mr. Mill, while he generally uses the term “cost of production” as synonymous with wages and profits, does in his discussion of international trade and international values, and of money as an imported commodity, steadily keep in view its other meaning of sacrifice, or of the amounts of labor and abstinence required in production, as Ricardo had done before him. Indeed, the ease with which this ambiguity fixed itself in his reasoning is disclosed by a single passage, which marks the transition from one conception of the term to the other : —

“What the production of a thing costs to its producer, or its series of producers, is the labor expended in producing it. If we consider as the producer the capitalist who makes the advances, the word ‘labor’ may be replaced by

the word 'wages'; what the produce cost to him is the wages which he has had to pay." — *Ibid.*, Book III. ch. iv. § 1.

Here again, therefore, the book before us renders valuable service, by clearing up a point in the nomenclature of the science. But this service is not accomplished at the expense of any break in continuous development. On the contrary, the revision of a fundamental conception has introduced harmony where before there was a subtle contradiction, and has strengthened the whole body of essential principles to which the conception relates. As it now stands, the theory of international values, or of values in the absence of effective competition, is firmly knit with the general theory of value, and appears to be susceptible of a far more satisfactory and simple statement than has ever yet been possible. That this should be the result of an analysis and revision so searching as that of Professor Cairnes, raises a new and overwhelming presumption in favor of the solidity of the scientific basis on which the work of Ricardo and Mill rests.

We must in conclusion point out a signal instance in which Professor Cairnes defends the continuity of economical science against no less an assailant than Mr. Mill himself. It is well-known that Mr. Mill, having given definite form to the wages-fund theory in his "*Principles of Political Economy*," subsequently abandoned it, upon reviewing the objections brought against it by Mr. W. T. Thornton in his book on "*Labor*." The alacrity with which Mr. Mill thus retreated from a position supposed to be strong caused some surprise, but was generally ascribed to his well-known sympathy for the laboring class, which led him to welcome a chance of retreat from the scientific doctrine which seemed to block the way of most of their movements. This explanation of his palinode did more honor to Mr. Mill's heart than to his judgment. It has gained ground, however, and will be confirmed by Professor Cairnes's examination of the arguments finally admitted by Mr. Mill as conclusive against the doctrine. Without entering into the subject at large, we can best state the case by citing from Mr. Mill's article of surrender the doctrine in the form in which he agrees with Mr. Thornton that it is untenable : —

"There is supposed to be, at any given instance, a sum of wealth, which is unconditionally devoted to the payment of the wages of labor. This sum is not regarded as unalterable, for it is augmented by saving, and increases with the progress of wealth; but it is reasoned upon as at any given moment a predetermined amount. More than that amount it is assumed that the wages-receiving class cannot possibly divide among them; that amount, and no less, they cannot but obtain. So that, the sum to be divided being fixed,

the wages of each depends solely on the divisor, the number of participants." — *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1869, p. 515.

This notion of a "predetermined" sum to be divided among the recipients by a process in long division, no individual employer being sensible of any such invincible necessity for paying out exactly so much and no more, Mr. Mill naturally agrees with Mr. Thornton in rejecting, and so does Professor Cairnes. And the latter points out with all due respect that it was not in this form that Mr. Mill, in his "Principles of Political Economy," conceived and stated the doctrine of the wages-fund. The notion of a rigid "predetermination" which compels the payment of a certain sum is a gloss upon the original text, inconsistent with the doctrine itself and with the nature of economic laws in general. For, says Professor Cairnes, —

"What an economic law asserts is, not that men must do so and so whether they like it or not, but that in given circumstances they will like to do so and so; that their self-interests or other feelings will lead them to this result. . . . It is in this sense that, speaking for myself, I understand the 'predetermination' of a certain portion of the wealth of a country to the payment of wages. I believe that, in the existing state of the national wealth, the character of Englishmen being what it is, a certain prospect of profit will 'determine' a certain proportion of this wealth to productive investment; that the amount thus 'determined' will increase as the field for investment is extended, and that it will not increase beyond what this field can find employment for at that rate of profit which satisfies English commercial expectation." (p. 185.)

It is safe to say that it is only upon this understanding that Mr. Mill could ever have reconciled the doctrine with his reasoning as to the effect of the rate of profit on the accumulation of wealth. The wages-fund is not so many hundred millions of pounds, shillings, and pence irrevocably destined to be divided among so many millions of laborers; it is that share of existing wealth which the body of capitalists, with their average desire for gain and with the chances of profit such as they are at the time, will be led to expend in the support of labor. To this understanding Professor Cairnes recalls the readers of Mr. Mill's overhasty concession to Mr. Thornton, and he then re-establishes the doctrine on ground which cannot be shaken, we believe, until the fundamental proposition, that industry is limited by capital, is disproved. In this case, then, unless we greatly mistake, Professor Cairnes has restored the continuity of economic speculation, when threatened with confusion by what seems, *pace tanti viri*, the momentary defection of a master of the science.

And, finally, we must inquire whether Professor Cairnes's concep-

tion of the nature of economic laws and of economic science differs from that of Mr. Mill and of the other leading writers on this subject. In his essay on the "Definition and Method of Political Economy," Mr. Mill, in harmony with his chief predecessors, declares that political economy is not the science of speculative politics, but only a branch of that science, treating not of the whole of man's nature or conduct in society, but of so much of his nature and conduct as relates to the pursuit of wealth. It simply aims to show what will be the course of action when men in society are impelled by the desire for wealth, abstraction being made of all other motives : —

"Not," he says, "that any political economist was ever so absurd as to suppose that mankind are really thus constituted, but because this is the mode in which science must necessarily proceed. Where an effect depends upon a concurrence of causes, those causes must be studied one at a time, and their laws separately investigated, if we wish, through the causes, to obtain the power of either predicting or controlling the effect, since the law of the effect is compounded of the laws of all the causes which determine it." — *Essays on some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy*, p. 139.

Indeed, the method is precisely that which is adopted in physical science, as, for example, when the centripetal and centrifugal forces are separately investigated. The conclusions of political economy, then, are rarely a formula for legislation ; they are but a part of the considerations on which legislators must base their action. This view is the same which is found, less elaborately but none the less distinctly enunciated, in his "Principles." To the same effect is a passage in the seventh chapter of his "Autobiography." And it follows from this view of political economy in general, as he declares in his chapter on rents, that "we must never forget that the truths of political economy are truths only in the rough." In any concrete case allowance must be made for disturbing influences, which indeed may countervail, but do not contradict, the law ; and in general the law, as a statement of the results from certain causes, must be taken as true of the average of cases, and not as the precise rule of each case by itself.

This view of the general position of political economy as a branch of social science is that which is held by Professor Cairnes. Indeed, people who, as Mr. Mill says, "know nothing but political economy, and therefore know that ill," might be shocked to find the Professor declaring in one of his essays (*Essays on Political Economy*, p. 256), that "there are few practical problems which do not present other aspects than the purely economical, — political, moral, educa-

tional, artistic aspects, — and these may involve consequences so weighty as to turn the scale against purely economic solutions." His conception of an economic law we have already referred to. It is the only conception of such a law which is consistent with the definition given to the science by Mr. Mill himself. Indeed, Professor Cairnes declares that "if economic doctrines in general are to be understood . . . as expressing principles which compel human beings to the adoption of certain courses of conduct in despite of their own inclination and will, there is not a single one in the whole range of economic science that could endure ten minutes' criticism." Such a law does not say that under the given conditions A B must or will do so and so, but simply that under these conditions "the average man" will be induced to do so; and in this sense are such laws laid down and expounded by Ricardo and Mill.

We have so far protracted our inquiry into the continuity which is to be found in Professor Cairnes's recasting of political economy, that we have not left ourselves room to express adequately our sense of the service performed by him. The work which he has accomplished was necessary, and no other hand could have done it. To remove faulty material from the very foundations of the science, to build where the structure was incomplete, and to harmonize and strengthen those parts which were discordant or weak, is a task for a master workman. We have examined a few leading instances which show the general direction of his labors; and must now refer our readers to the book itself for evidence of what has been done for many special questions of great interest, by a discussion conducted upon the well-established lines.

-
11. — *The Communistic Societies of the United States; from Personal Visit and Observation; including detailed Accounts of the Economists, Zoarites, Shakers, the Amana, Oneida, etc.* By CHARLES NORDHOFF. With Illustrations. New York: Harper and Brothers. pp. 439.

WE suppose it is useless to expect or express the wish that Mr. Nordhoff should be more methodical in his books. He follows the school-boy's maxim of beginning in the middle and leaving off at both ends; and thus he produces a book which is full of interest, but more or less confusing to the reader. Mr. Noyes, in his "History of American Socialisms," published four or five years ago, displays a similar lack of external method; but he seems to have understood better than Mr. Nordhoff the internal or ideal connection and sequence of